

What could be more positive than statements like these from a respected and noted writer? He goes on to say:

—the house can...make the levying of income tax and surtax unlawful by failing to pass the finance bill.

I continue quoting from page 450:

A government will not give way on a major question of policy.

No one can contest that the measure which was brought forward last Monday night was not a matter of major government policy. On page 457 Jennings says this, and I am about to read the quotation that the Prime Minister read in part but did not finish:

It must not be thought, however, that a single defeat necessarily demands either resignation or dissolution. Such a result follows only where the defeat implies loss of confidence.

Our case is that the defeat of the bill on Monday night implied loss of confidence because that bill was the very core of the government budget. Citing Mr. Ramsay MacDonald of England in 1924, Jennings says on page 459:

The Labour government will go out if it is defeated upon substantial issues, issues of principle, issues which really matter... If the house on matters non-essential, matters of mere opinion, matters that do not strike at the root of the proposals that we make, and do not destroy fundamentally the general intentions of the government in introducing legislation—if the house wish to vary our propositions, the house must take the responsibility for that variation—then a division on such amendments and questions as those will not be regarded as a vote of no confidence.

We have the matter in the negative as well. I have been unable to find an example of a government which, having been defeated on its budget, has failed to resign.

Mr. Woolliams: That is quite right.

Mr. Nielsen: I shall be only a moment or two, sir. At page 461 Jennings says:

Four factors really determine the attitude of a government to a parliamentary defeat.

He lists these factors and goes on to say:

The fourth is the importance of the proposal or matter on which it was defeated. A defeat on an important part of the budget, as in 1852 and 1885, is obviously too important to be passed over.

The last precedent I wish to cite is from "The Government of Canada" by Professor Robert MacGregor Dawson, professor of political economy at the University of Toronto. The position which he reinforces is to be found in an article in *The Canadian Journal*

Motion Respecting House Vote

of Economics and Political Science for August, 1946. He says in part:

The cabinet must therefore introduce and sponsor all measures to spend or to raise money; and as any proposed amendment which would endeavour to diminish a tax or an expenditure contrary to the cabinet's wishes would be treated as a vote of lack of confidence, its control over finance is not likely to be seriously threatened.

So we have it from this acknowledged constitutional expert that a vote like last Monday night's vote can be treated, by implication, as a vote of non-confidence. He fortifies that position by saying on page 265:

Thus if a cabinet is defeated on any of its measures or on a vote of censure by the house, one of two consequences must ensue: either the cabinet must be changed so that the commons can obtain an executive which will give it the leadership it desires, or the commons can obtain an executive which will give it the leadership it desires, or the commons must itself be changed to provide the cabinet with the support to which it is entitled if it is to remain in office. One of two courses of action are thus available following a cabinet's defeat: the resignation of the cabinet, or the dissolution of the house; the one gives the house a new cabinet, the other gives the cabinet a new house.

That is the constitutional position, sir, and this government is flying in the teeth of that position. We have a government whose major policy is to cling to office. The Prime Minister on Friday gave us the spectacle of a man clinging to office like a drunken man clinging to a sinking spar. All the others were clinging with him. Their major financial policy was defeated, rejected and repudiated by parliament last Monday night but they are prepared to swallow that. They will swallow anything as long as they can stay in office.

Mr. Starr: It turns one's stomach.

Mr. Nielsen: Our stomachs and the stomachs of the people of this nation are not that strong. One can understand the government's desperate desire to stay on. They have made such a mess of things. They are terrified of what a new government would uncover. A cursory reading of the Auditor General's report reveals the existence of skeletons in the government's closets, skeletons of such dimensions that their existence must be a waking nightmare to hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches.

This government is living on borrowed time and all that we on this side can do is close its eyes. It has forfeited the right to occupy the treasury benches. It is a bankrupt government, politically and economically. It is a government which will go to any lengths